

REMARKS

This Response is prepared in response to the Final Office action mailed on 1 April 2008 (Paper No. 20080314). Claims 1-9 are pending.

Prior Art Rejections

In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner maintained the 35 U.S.C. §103 prior art rejections of claims 1-9. Specifically, in Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. (US 6,473,407), in view of Dorland et al. (US 2003/0028577). In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner also rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. ‘407 and Dorland et al. ‘577. In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner also rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. ‘407. In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner also rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. ‘407, further in view of Dorland et al. ‘577. In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner also rejected claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. ‘407, in view of Flanagan (“JavaScript: The definitive Guide, 4th Edition”). In Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner also rejected claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. ‘407 and Dorland et al. ‘577, in view of Flanagan (“JavaScript: The definitive Guide, 4th Edition”). Applicant has the following comments:

Summary of Prosecution

In the first Office action of Paper No. 20070920, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 using either Ditmer alone or using Ditmer in view of Dorland. In Applicant's February 6, 2008 Amendment, Applicant argued that the Ditmer/Dorland combination failed to fairly teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Specifically, Applicant argued that Applicant claimed in each of independent claims 1 and 4 that Applicant has a *lightweight* alarm manager in a Web browser that has a data frame that receives alarm information from a Network Management System (NMS) and *a contents frame that has dynamic HTML* that reads the alarm information of the data frame. Applicant argued that this claimed arrangement is lightweight in that it *does not require a separate loading program* as in Ditmer. Applicant also explained in the February 6 amendment that Ditmer needs a separate applet COApp or COApplet, and thus Ditmer's arrangement requires a separate loading program to be downloaded and ran, which causes delay. As a result, Ditmer's event monitor is not lightweight but is instead heavy weight.

On Page 3 of the present Final Office action of Paper No. 20080314, the Examiner responded to Applicant's February 6 comments by saying:

“The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because the Java-based COApplet disclosed by Ditmer et al. extends the Applet class and may be launched by the browser from an HTML <Applet> tag. It is in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art that Java Applet is embedded in a HTML page, delivered in the form of Java byte-code, and run in a Web browser using a Java Virtual Machine (JVM) to generate dynamic contents without a separate loading program.

Accordingly, the examiner considers “an HTML page with Java applets using the <applet> tag” as a “Dynamic HTML” based on its definition provided by the applicant in section 2 “Description of Related Art” of the specification on page 2, paragraph [0005]. Therefore, an HTML page that contains CoApplet with an <Applet> tag as disclosed by Ditmer et al. is equivalent to the dynamic HTML content frame recited in claims 1 and 4.”

Applicant disagrees with the above quoted Examiner’s analysis and conclusion for the following reasons:

Because Applicant’s claimed invention uses dynamic HTML, it can connect to the Network Management System (NMS) database to receive alarm information quickly. However, in the case of the Java applet contained within the Web browser (Web page) of Ditmer, the information in Ditmer must be sent to a user together with the Web page, which can be considered a separate loading program. Therefore, a separate loading program must be loaded in Ditmer.

In other words, since Applicant’s claimed invention can implement an alarm manager using dynamic HTML offered within a Web browser (for example JavaScript), no additional program is required in Applicant’s claimed invention. Ditmer, on the other hand, requires the loading of a separate program or Java applet.

In conclusion, while Applicant’s invention provides a lightweight method requiring no additional programs to be loaded, Ditmer discloses a heavy-weight method in which a program is required to be loaded. As a result, Applicant submits that the Ditmer/Dorland

combination can not fairly teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited references, taken either alone or combination and accordingly should now be in a conditions suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56960
Date: 7/1/08
I.D.: REB/ML

'O:Auto-reply fax to 202 408 9753 COMPANY:

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission



TO: Fax Sender at 202 408 9753

Fax Information

Date Received:

Total Pages:

7/1/2008 6:50:01 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]
5 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page
=====>



07/01/2008 18:49 FAX 202 408 9753		R. E. BUSHNELL	→ US PTO	001
PATENT PS6960				
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE				
In re Application of:				
JONG-KY LEE				
Serial No.:	10/772,392	Examiner:	ZHANG, SHIRLEY X.	
Filed:	6 February 2004	Art Unit:	2144	
For:	LIGHTWEIGHT ALARM MANAGER ON WEB BROWSER AND SERVICE METHOD THEREOF, AND METHOD OF PROVIDING ALARM INFORMATION THEREOF			
<u>RESPONSE AFTER FINAL</u>				
Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O.Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450				
Sir:				
In response to the final Office action mailed on 1 April 2008 (Paper No. 20080314), entry of the following amendments and remarks, re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.				
CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION				
I hereby certify that, on 1 July 2008, this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (Facsimile No. 571-273-8300)				
Total 5 sheets				
 For Robert E. Bushnell Reg. No. 27,774				
Folio: PS6960 Date: 7/1/08 I.D.: REB/ML/fw				

PAGE 119 * RCV'D AT 7/1/2008 6:50:01 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * BYR:USPTO-FAXRF-8/21 * DMS:2738390 * CNO:202-408-9753 * DURATION min:00:01-01